

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for reviewing the present patent application. Applicants greatly appreciate the Examiner's assistance with claims 17-20, the same should have been identified as previously presented in the Reply made under 37 CFR §1.111.

I. Claim Objections

In view of the present Office Action, it is apparent that all claim objections are withdrawn. Applicants appreciate and acknowledge the Examiner's conclusion regarding the same.

II. Rejection Under 35 USC §102(a)

The Examiner has now rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 17-20 under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by non-patent literature submission: Abstract of a presentation at a skin conference in Hamburg, 2003, specifically Flament et al., and entitled, "Finger Perception Metrology", (hereinafter, abstract).

In the rejection, the Examiner continues, believes and mentions, in summary, that the abstract discloses a tactile acoustic emission measurement apparatus having a means for acoustic signal-generating, collecting, storing, displaying and correlating of frictional forces, where the frictional forces are capable of being operably generated via animal skin on one area rubbing animal skin on another area. The Examiner further mentions and believes that the abstract discloses a clinical evaluation tool suitable for use by

consumers and clinicians to evaluate the effect of the application of cosmetic compositions. Based on the above, the Examiner continues to believe that the novelty rejection is warranted.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's apparent position to the contrary, it is the Applicants' position, again, that the presently claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the above-described for at least the following reasons.

As already made of record on numerous occasions, independent claim 1, as presented, is directed to an acoustic emission measurement system comprising:

(A) means for generating an acoustic emission signal from a body by contacting skin on one area of the body with skin on another area of the body to produce skin/skin frictional forces;

(B) means for collecting, storing and displaying said emission signal;

(C) means for correlating said emission signal with an attribute of said skin;

wherein said system is used as a clinical tool to evaluate efficacy of cosmetic skin care and/or cleansing products.

Again, the invention of claim 1 is further defined by dependent claims which claim, among other things, that the means for displaying the emission signal comprises a medium selected from the internet, a camera, palm pilot, mobile phone, mobile camera phone and advertising and promotional material that can include a television, magazines, brochures, posters, flyers and handouts. Additionally, claim 1 is further defined by dependent claims which claim, among other things that the system may be used by a consumer, beautician, or professional advisors and that the correlating represents attributes of pores, wrinkles, photo aging or skin texture. Previously presented claims 17-20 further define claim 1 such that the system is suitable for use in

an acoustic medium which is air, water or an aqueous solution and the emission signal is generated from a hand or finger or a second body part. Again, Applicants wish to point out to the Examiner that the present system is superior in that an acoustic emission signal from the body is generated by contacting skin-on-skin (please, again, see the limitations of the independent claims). Direct application of a probe or device onto the body is not required and this is what makes the present invention superior.

Independent claim 5 describes a cosmetic product selection and/or customization system comprising the acoustic emission system of claim 1. The same, again, is further defined by the dependent claims which claim, among other things, the type of medium which may be used.

In contrast, and as already made of record, the abstract relied on by the Examiner is merely directed to finger perception metrology whereby finger sliding tests are performed on various abrasive papers to show a good correlation of the co-efficient of friction and the variations of acoustic signals (please see Sec. 19, pages 168-169 of the abstract). Again, a prototype of perception metrology, therefore, is described to quantify the friction and acoustic signals during the sliding of the finger on a surface of materials. The teachings of the abstract clearly teach away from the presently claimed invention which creates emission signals from a body by contacting skin-on-skin (please see the limitations of the independent claims). Direct application of a device onto the body is not required in the current invention but is required in the technology described in the reference. Clearly, the abstract teaches the use of abrasive papers (result section). Turning to claims 17-20, since the claims rely on independent claims requiring skin-on-skin frictional forces, they are not anticipated in view of the abstract of record. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the "Results" section where the abstract teaches that finger sliding tests are performed on various abrasive papers, and

the “Conclusion” section of the abstract where it has been reported that there is good correlation between the force of friction and the acoustic signal measured with the finger and an acoustic sensor on the skin.

In view of this, and again, it is clear that all the important and critical limitations set forth in the presently claimed invention are not found in a single reference, namely the abstract. It is also clear the abstract teaches away from the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants, again, request that the novelty rejection be withdrawn and rendered moot.

III. Rejection Under 35 USC §103

The Examiner continues to reject claims 2 and 7 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over the abstract of record in view of non-patent literature submission abstract of a presentation at a skin conference in Hamburg, 2003, Fleming “Mobile, multimedia computing for improved clinicopathologic correlation in dermatopathology (hereinafter, “Fleming”).

In the rejection, the Examiner continues to mention, in summary, that the abstract discloses the claimed invention for the reasons set forth above and that Fleming teaches a means for digitally displaying test results via the internet and/or handheld computers. In view of this, the Examiner continues to believe that claims 2 and 7 are appropriately rejected under 35 USC §103.

Notwithstanding the Examiner’s apparent position to the contrary, it is the Applicants’ position, again, that the presently claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the above-described for at least the following reasons.

As already made of record, the present inventions are directed to an acoustic emission measurement system and a cosmetic product selection and/or customization system that rely on the generation of acoustic emission signals from the body by contacting skin on one area of the body with skin on another area of the body to produce skin/skin frictional forces. As already made of record, the abstract requires sliding of the finger on various abrasive papers and does not rely on skin/skin frictional forces as set forth in the presently claimed inventions. In fact, the abstract teaches away from the presently claimed invention. While the Fleming abstract mentions the use of computers running software in dermatopathology laboratories, it does not cure the vast deficiencies of the abstract since the combination of references relied on by the Examiner, again, does not, even remotely, suggest ways to assess skin via skin/skin frictional forces.

In view of the above, it is clear that all the important and critical limitations set forth in the presently claimed invention are not found in the combination of references relied on by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants, again, request that the obviousness rejection be withdrawn and rendered moot.

Turning to the response to the arguments, Applicants, again, submit that there is no teaching in the references relied on by the Examiner that even remotely addresses skin-on-skin frictional forces. In fact, the result section of the Flament abstract, again, clearly describes the finger sliding on various abrasive papers to show a good correlation of the coefficient of friction and the variations of acoustic signal. No skin-on-skin contact is even remotely addressed.

In view of the above, Applicants, again, request that all claims of record now be passed to issue. Reconsideration and favorable action are earnestly solicited.

Applicants further submit that all claims of record are ready for appeal but would appreciate recommendations from the Examiner so that the expense of an appeal may be avoided.

In the event the Examiner has any questions concerning the present patent application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned counsel at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. A. Squillante, Jr.', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Edward A. Squillante, Jr.
Registration No. 38,319
Attorney for Applicant(s)

EAS/pod
(201) 894-2925